

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

Reply Brief

In re the Application of:

Laurence E. England, Howard J. Glaser, and Robert D. Moyer

Serial No. 09/591,035
Filed: June 9, 2000
Attorney Docket No. STL920000063US1

Examiner: Adnan M. Mirza
Art Unit: 2145

METHOD OF, SYSTEM FOR, AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR
PROVIDING AN E-BUSINESS CONNECTOR BUILDER

Submitted by:

Konrad, Raynes & Victor LLP
315 So. Beverly Dr., Ste. 210
Beverly Hills CA 90212
(310) 556-7983
(310) 556-7984 (fax)

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1-24 are pending and have been rejected in view of prior art. The final rejection of the claims is being appealed for all pending claims 1-24.

II. Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed on Appeal

A concise statement listing each ground of rejection presented for review is as follows:

Whether claims 1-24 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Helgeson et al. (U.S. 2002/0073236, hereinafter “Helgeson”) and in view of O’Brien et al. (U.S. 6,351,776, hereinafter “O’Brien”).

III. Argument / Reply to Examiner's Response to Appellant's Argument

Independent claim 1 describes a computer-implemented method of adapting a transaction-based mainframe application to process transactions over a network, wherein the transaction-based mainframe application is unable to process transactions over a World Wide Web (Web).

As to Applicants' argument that the transaction-based mainframe application is unable to process transactions over a World Wide Web (Web) is not taught or suggested, the Examiner cites the Helgeson patent application, page 2, paragraph 15, which states:

The programs of instructions comprise a first component for translating a data object from a first system specific local format to a generic interchange format object, a second component for translating the data object from the generic interchange format to a second system specific local format object, and a third component for transferring the data object between the first and second system. The first component further comprises a system independent service subcomponent and a system specific service subcomponent utilizing a native API of said first system to translate said data object to a generic interchange format object using a predefined stylesheet.

The Examiner submits that one of ordinary skill the art at the time of the invention knows about translating the data in different format from one system to different systems. Applicants respectfully submit that the Helgeson patent application

does not teach or suggest *adapting a transaction-based mainframe application to process transactions over a network, wherein the transaction-based mainframe application is unable to process transactions over a World Wide Web (Web)*.

Instead, the Helgeson patent application is directed to managing data exchange among systems in a network (Abstract). The translation of the data object of the Helgeson patent does not teach or suggest adapting a transaction-based mainframe application to process transactions over a network, wherein the transaction-based mainframe application is unable to process transactions over a World Wide Web (Web). Also, because the Helgeson patent describes the third component for transferring the data object between the first and second system, there is no need in the Helgeson patent for adapting a transaction-based mainframe application to process transactions over a network, wherein the transaction-based mainframe application is unable to process transactions over a World Wide Web (Web). Moreover, the Helgeson patent application describes a system that "is predominantly web-enabled, which extends its use to all industry professionals connected to the Internet" (Paragraph 42). Because the Helgeson patent application is predominantly web-enabled, there is no need in the Helgeson patent application for adapting a transaction-based mainframe application to process transactions over a network, wherein the transaction-based mainframe application is unable to process transactions over a World Wide Web (Web).

Thus, the Helgeson patent application again has no need to perform the claimed processing that creates a connector to enable the transaction-based mainframe application to process transactions over the web by enabling the transactions to be passed from a web application server to the transaction-based mainframe application.

Independent claim 1 describes scanning the source code of the transaction-based mainframe application to identify the transaction and the related information and storing in a database the related information identified in the scan of the source code, hereinafter identified information. The Examiner cites paragraph 526 of the Helgeson patent application, which states:

Web Content Server 800 can also provide the platform's web content generation engine for use by users to create, render, and present web content while improving the dynamic acquisition of data from a variety of sources followed by its reformatting and display via style sheets. Using web standards for XML and XSL, Web Content Server 800 provides a user with a customizable framework for decoupling data from presentation, and generating web content in a variety of formats, from standard HTML to WML.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Helgeson patent application fails to teach scanning application source code to identify a transaction and related information related to the transaction. Applicants respectfully submit that web content generation does not teach or suggest scanning the source code of the transaction-based mainframe application *to identify the transaction and the related information and storing in a database the related information* identified in the scan of the source code.

As to Applicants' argument that the Helgeson patent application is predominantly web-enabled, and so there is no need to enable a transaction-based mainframe application

that is not originally designed to process transactions over the web to do so, the Examiner cites paragraph 420 of the Helgeson patent application, which describes:

In the alternative embodiment, transactional integrity can be maintained as follows. Consider a session bean which, as part of its remote interface, has declared a method `cancelClass()` that encapsulates the business process of canceling a class. As part of class cancellation, we also wish to, say, remove the registration records of the persons registered for the class. The registration information is maintained by `SabaRegistration` entity beans. Hence, within the implementation of `cancelClass()`, besides updating some attribute of the `SabaClass` entity bean to indicate cancellation, we would also encode logic for finding the `SabaRegistration` entity beans corresponding to that class and then removing them. However, either all these activities must succeed atomically, or no change to persistent store should be made (i.e., the activities constitute a transaction). This would be accomplished by declaring a transactional attribute of `TX_REQUIRED` for the method `cancelClass()` in the bean's deployment descriptor. If the calling client or bean already has a transaction started, the method will then be executed within the scope of that transaction; otherwise, a new transaction will automatically be started for this method.

Applicants respectfully submit that maintaining transactional integrity does not show a need in the Helgeson patent application to enable the transaction-based mainframe application to process transactions over the web by enabling the transactions

to be passed from a web application server to the transaction-based mainframe application.

The Examiner goes on to say: "One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention knows that couple of ways first by scanning the codes to transfer the application content between two different operating system and it doesn't matter what kind of operating system should be included and second by specifying the specific parameters." Applicants respectfully submit that this does not show a need in the Hegleson patent application to enables the transaction-based mainframe application to process transactions over the web by enabling the transactions to be passed from a web application server to the transaction-based mainframe application. Also, this does not teach or suggest identifying a parameter usage type for each parameter, said parameter usage type selectable from the parameter usage type set comprising input, output, input/output, and unreferenced.

Additionally, claim 1 describes using the identified information and extracted information to package the user-selected transaction in a form compatible with a connector building tool by generating a communication area file that may be parsed by the connector building tool to build a connector and a documentation file that provides documentation about the communication area file. The Examiner submits that "one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention knows that in order for the application to run another operating you just build an interface between that application and the operating system environment." Applicants submit that "you just build an interface" does not teach or suggest the claimed use of the identified information and extracted information to package the user-selected transaction in a form compatible with a

connector building tool by generating a communication area file that may be parsed by the connector building tool to build a connector and a documentation file that provides documentation about the communication area file.

The Examiner goes on to say that that "One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention interpreted the connector pool also pool of drivers or interfaces that contains in order for different application to be able to communicate with different operating systems, whereas interface is actually written software code to have the application and the operating system to understand each other and that is also true regarding Helgeson." Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants respectfully submit that a "connection pool" is not a connector building tool, and the O'Brien patent teaches at col. 8, lines 16-18 that the "EJB cluster (EJBC) caches memory of common resources such as the pooling of data connections and the like, as well as data objects." Thus, a connection pool is the pooling of data connections, rather than the claimed connector building tool.

Moreover, the law is well settled that a reference will not support a rejection based upon obviousness where the proposed modification to the reference contravenes the principle of operation of the device of the reference:

If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious. In re Ratti , 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959)

The Examiner appears to be impermissibly modifying the connection pool of the O'Brien patent to include a pool of drivers or interfaces.

Thus, the subject matter of independent claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the Helgeson patent application or the O'Brien patent, either alone or in combination.

The subject matter of claims 9 and 17 are not taught or suggested by the Helgeson patent application or the O'Brien patent, either alone or in combination, at least for the reasons discussed with reference to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 incorporate the language of independent claims 1, 9, and 17 and add additional novel elements. Therefore, dependent claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are not taught or suggested by the Helgeson patent application or the O'Brien patent, either alone or in combination, for at least the same reasons as were discussed with respect to claims 1, 9, and 17.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-24 as obvious over the Helgeson and O'Brien combination should be reversed.

Should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

Respectfully submitted,

/Janaki K. Davda/

Janaki K. Davda
Reg. No. 40,684
Konrad Raynes & Victor LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, California 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984

Dated: April 5, 2007